# Language maintenance and shift patterns of the Turkish speakers in The Netherlands

Yagmur, Kutlay; Bayram Jacobs, Dürdane

*Published in:*
Journal of Social Sciences in the Turkish World

*Publication date:*
2015

*Document Version*
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

bilig
SUMMER 2015 / NUMBER 74
259-286

# Language maintenance and shift patterns of the Turkish speakers in The Netherlands

**Kutlay Yağmur**[*]
**Dürdane Bayram Jacobs**[**]

**Abstract**
Language maintenance, shift and ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions of Turkish speakers in the Netherlands are discussed in this paper. Using ethnolinguistic vitality theory of Giles, Bourhis &Taylor (1977) data on language use, choice and attitudes of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands were collected. Using education as an independent variable, data has been analysed. The findings of this study have contributed further evidence to the role of education for language maintenance and shift. Better-educated Turkish immigrants have higher proficiency levels both in L1 and L2 compared to less educated informants but their attitudes towards Turkish is not as positive as the less educated group.

**Keywords**
Turkish immigrants, Netherlands, ethnolinguistic vitality, language maintenance and shift

## Introduction

This study examines language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrants and their subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions in The Netherlands. Among the countries where language use behaviour of Turkish immigrants is researched, the Netherlands is one of the most interesting contexts. The Netherlands is known to be a highly liberal country

[*] Prof. Dr., Tilburg University, Department of Culture Studies – Tilburg / The Netherlands
k.yagmur@tilburguniversity.edu
[**] Dr.,Tilburg University, Department of Culture Studies – Tilburg / The Netherlands
durdane@secmo.nl

respecting minority rights in general and individual's rights in particular. The Dutch are also known to be highly pragmatic and goal-oriented people. Before the immigrant communities were seen as "problems," Dutch policy makers had one of the best sets of policies and regulations concerning the language and education rights of immigrant children in Western Europe. The issue of "immigrant integration" has been occupying the political agenda for the last 20 years, and especially in the last decade, this issue has become obsession for some right-wing politicians. Whether such intense discussions affect immigrants' language use and integration patterns or not is not certain but the mainstream society demands full linguistic and cultural integration of the newcomers. Language and integration policies of immigrant receiving countries have been discussed in Volume 70 of *Bilig* (2014). In this paper, in addition to language, use, choice, and attitudes of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands, the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality will be discussed in depth. On the basis of the results obtained and in line with the latest theoretical framework of Bourhis (2001), interethnic differences in ethnolinguistic vitality beliefs and their meaning in the Dutch context will be discussed thoroughly. In the next section, a profile of Turkish community in the Netherlands is presented. After a short account of Turkish immigration to the Netherlands, sociocultural, demographic, educational, and institutional information on Turkish group will be documented.

## Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands

In this section, social, linguistic, educational and demographic characteristics of Turks in the Netherlands are documented. Following the period after the Second World War, some Western European countries had shortage of manual labour due to various economic and demographic factors. Turkey joined the labour exporting countries at a rather later stage during the 1960's. Unlike many other southern European immigrant workers, Turkish workforce migration was a highly planned one. There were bilateral agreements between the West European and Turkish governments. From the beginning, it was made clear that these workers were to be employed for some undefined period and they were subject to bilateral agreements between the governments. Recruitment agreements were signed with Germany in 1961, with the Netherlands, Belgium, and Austria in 1964, with France in 1965 and with Sweden in 1967.

Turkish workforce immigration to the Netherlands differs in some ways from Germany or France. Other than workers with recruitment contracts, many unemployed Turks from Central Anatolia arrived in the Nether-

lands as tourists. These people found jobs on their own initiatives and in most cases they did not have any work permits. The Dutch government gave work permits to 75% of those illegal workers in 1965. As there were no selection procedures for these workers, they had very different characteristics compared to workers with recruitment contracts. In most cases, they had very little or no schooling. Most of them were coming from isolated villages of Central Anatolia, which magnified the socio-cultural and linguistic differences with the host society. Until family re-union took place in the 1970s, not many people seemed to notice or at least complain about such differences because in most cases Turks worked and lived in isolation from the mainstream society. Nowadays, issues of integration, unemployment, school dropouts, and criminality are associated with immigrants in the media. Such media representation is not always well founded. According to Brands, Crone, Leurdijk, and Top (1998), almost without exception, immigrants are always associated with problems in the Dutch media. Turkish and Moroccan groups seem to get the highest share in this negative projection.

## Demographic characteristics

After Germany and France, the third largest group of Turkish immigrants (about 380,000) reside in the Netherlands. Turkish group is the largest immigrant group in the country. Like in other immigration contexts, Turks concentrate mainly in major urban centres. Majority of Turks live in Rotterdam (12.8%) followed by Amsterdam (10.8%), The Hague (8.4%), and Utrecht (3.5%). In these major concentration areas, they also tend to live in the same suburbs, which provide them with a broader social network. Compared to the mainstream society, Turkish immigrants are rather young. The majority of (80.2%) Turkish immigrants are below age forty. Even though the childbearing characteristics of Turkish women are similar to native Dutch women, general public hold the view that birth rates among immigrant women are much higher.

The type of marriage (endogamous or exogamous) is considered to be an important variable in language maintenance and shift studies. When members of a minority language group marry from another ethnolinguistic group, the chance of shifting to the mainstream language is most likely. The extent of in-group marriages among Turks is high compared to most other major ethnic groups in the Netherlands. Most of the Turkish immigrants marry with someone from the same ethnic-linguistic background. According to 2002 data of Central Bureau Statistics (CBS), majority of the first-generation men and women are married with someone from the

same ethnic background. The same trend is valid for the second-generation. As young immigrants marry mostly with someone from the homeland, the number of immigrants arriving through family formation increases each year.

In the following sections, information on the design of the current study, the methodology, the instruments and the participants are presented.

## The design of the investigation

Given the sociolinguistic situation described above, the main aim of this study is to see the effect of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions on language maintenance, use and choice of Turkish immigrants in The Netherlands. In the literature on EVT, few empirical attempts have been made to test how subjective vitality perceptions could predict the language behaviour of ethnolinguistic groups (Allard & Landry, 1986; Bourhis & Sachdev, 1984; Yagmur, 1997; Yagmur & Akinci, 2003). Most of these studies were conducted in the Australian and Canadian contexts. However, in the European context, there are few studies investigating the relationship between the ethnolinguistic vitality of an ethnic group and the extent of the group's first language maintenance or shift, which necessitates more empirical evidence. By conducting this study, the effects of subjective vitality perceptions on language behaviour of Turkish immigrants in The Netherlands will be tested. Apart from the SEVQ, by means of a sociolinguistic questionnaire, self-reports of Dutch and Turkish language skills, language choice, and attitudes of Turkish speakers will be documented. As indicated in the literature, depending on the educational level of speakers, language use, choice and proficiency patterns differ. On the basis of the data collected, we wanted to test the following hypotheses:

1. Better-educated Turkish immigrants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish language than less educated immigrants.
2. Accordingly, concerning Turkish vitality, better-educated immigrants have higher subjective vitality ratings than less educated immigrants.
3. There is a relationship between first language use and ethnolinguistic vitality of the Turkish immigrants.

In order to test these hypotheses, two groups of informants were included in this study so that educational differences could be accounted for. In testing the third hypothesis, language use and proficiency of better and less educated informants will be correlated to subjective ethnolinguistic vitality ratings so that the level of interaction between these dimensions could be seen.

## Informants

The informants for this study were selected from the Turkish immigrants living in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Tilburg. In order to see the effect of educational differences, informants from different educational levels were selected. There are 89 informants, 46 of whom are females and 43 of them are males. Table 2 gives the details of informants.

**Table 2:** *Turkish informants of the study*

| Groups | Country of Birth | | Gender | | N | Mean Age |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Netherlands | Turkey | Female | Male | | |
| Low Education group (LEG) | 12 | 36 | 27 | 22 | 49 | 33.9 |
| High Education group (HEG) | 13 | 27 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 30.7 |
| Total | 25 | 63 | 46 | 43 | 89 | 32.5 |

## Data collection instruments

Three different questionnaires were used as data collection instruments: the *Language Use-Choice Questionnaire* (LUCQ), the *Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire* (SEVQ), and *Language Rating Scales* (LRS). The LUCQ was developed as a survey instrument. The questionnaire was used in different immigration contexts with Turkish immigrants (see Yagmur, de Bot & Korzilius, 1999; Yagmur & Akinci, 2003). The survey questionnaire included three sections on: background characteristics (demographic information), language use-choice, and language attitudes.

The Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (SEVQ) involved rating Dutch and Turkish immigrants to The Netherlands on 24 items, measuring group vitality along the three dimensions of Status, Demography, and Institutional Support dimensions. Original version of SEVQ as developed by Bourhis *et al*. (1981) was adapted and translated into Turkish and Dutch, and used in this study (for details of SEVQ see Bourhis *et al*. 1981). Two additional questions on the extent of in-group solidarity and importance of norms and values for the group are included in the questionnaire. SEVQ was also used in a number of immigration contexts with Turkish immigrants (See Yagmur, 1997).

The Clark (1981) self-rating scales, known also as *can-do scales*, is a language rating list on foreign language proficiency. Language tasks range from simple to more complex tasks, e.g., 'describe the role played by par-

liament'. The self-rating scales are used widely in language attrition research: Weltens (1988) employed self-rating scales for listening and reading comprehension in studying L2 attrition. De Bot and Lintsen (1989) used Clark's self-evaluation scales in the investigation of L1 attrition in an L1 environment with elderly people. Self-rating scales were also used in the investigation of German language attrition in Australia (Waas, 1993). Sometimes it is hard to assess whether the informants rate their skills on the basis of the linguistic demand of the task itself or on the basis of the knowledge required by the task. For instance, the item "describe the role of parliament in the system of government and state" requires, in the first place, relevant information on the topic. The speaker might linguistically be able to describe it but if s/he does not have knowledge on that particular topic, it cannot be done. Due to such limitations of the instrument, new rating-scales for understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills are developed for this study. In the present form of the task, informants are asked to rate their reading, writing, listening and speaking ability on forty language tasks on a scale of 1 (cannot do it) to 5 (can easily do it). Language tasks range from simple to more complex tasks. The informants rated both their Dutch and Turkish language skills.

## Results

The information obtained from the three questionnaires constituted a large database. In order to test the hypotheses, a number of statistical procedures were followed. Before going into those procedures, a global description of the results on the basis of descriptive statistics is presented in this section. In doing that, first, overall findings on LUCQ, LRS, and SEVQ will be documented. Consequently, on the basis of more advanced statistical procedures, the hypotheses will be tested.

## Findings on Language Use and Choice Questionnaire

A full discussion of all the items in the LUCQ is beyond the scope of this paper. There were four sub-sections in LUCQ on background characteristics (21 variables), language use (5 variables), attitudes (14 variables) and choice (6 variables). After presenting the descriptive statistics in the next section, total scores for each of the language use, choice, and attitudes as well as for Language Rating scales are calculated. On the basis of this data reduction, calculation of educational differences and correlation of different dimensions will be easier. Table 3 documents the findings on Dutch and Turkish use of high and low educated informants.

**Table 3:** *Patterns of first and second language use by high and low educated informants (N=89). The scale is 1 (very little) to 5 (very much).*

| Variables in the LUCQ | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Contact with the homeland | LEG | 49 | 3.04 | 1.48 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.67 | 1.16 |
| Amount of Turkish speaking in the Netherlands | LEG | 49 | 4.16 | .89 |
| | HEG | 39 | 4.15 | .87 |
| Difficulty speaking Turkish in Turkey | LEG | 48 | 2.17 | 1.52 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.57 | 1.03 |
| Difficulty in understanding Turkish in Turkey | LEG | 49 | 1.94 | 1.49 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.30 | .79 |
| Using Dutch words in Turkish discourse | LEG | 49 | 2.77 | 1.64 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.22 | 1.39 |
| Feeling of loss in Turkish mental lexicon | LEG | 49 | 2.96 | 1.46 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.75 | 1.30 |
| Amount of reading in Turkish | LEG | 49 | 3.00 | 1.40 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.45 | 1.09 |
| Difficulty experienced in reading Turkish | LEG | 49 | 2.28 | 1.38 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.90 | 1.13 |
| Amount of writing in Turkish | LEG | 48 | 2.44 | 1.44 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.87 | 1.18 |
| Extent of Turkish TV viewing | LEG | 49 | 3.71 | 1.32 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.55 | 1.11 |
| Extent of Dutch TV viewing | LEG | 48 | 3.44 | 1.41 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.92 | .83 |
| Participation in Turkish community organizations | LEG | 48 | 2.46 | 1.43 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.07 | 1.29 |

The results show that both groups (LEG & HEG) maintain close contacts with Turkey. Both the less educated group and better-educated group speak Turkish a great deal in the Netherlands. Less educated group reports having more difficulties both in understanding and speaking Turkish in Turkey. Both groups feel that they have difficulty remembering Turkish words. Both groups watch equally much Turkish TV, which shows their socio-cultural orientation. Concerning Dutch TV viewing, better-educated informants have higher ratings than older informants. Table 4,

on the other hand, presents findings on language use with different interlocutors. Irrespective of the educational differences, almost all the informants in the study report that they speak Turkish with their parents. A close examination of the percentages in Table 4 shows that there are minor differences between informants' language use patterns. Less educated Turks seem to use more Turkish with their friends and with their siblings. Interestingly, both groups of informants report that they mostly speak Turkish with their neighbours, which shows the structure of their social network.

**Table 4:** *Language register spoken with different interlocutors, group differences in percentages (%).*

| Interlocutors | Groups | Only Turkish | Mostly Turkish | Turkish Dutch Equal | Mostly Dutch | Only Dutch | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| With mother/father | LEG | 76 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| | HEG | 83 5.0% 7.5 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| with siblings | LEG | 41 4.1% 34.7% | 4 | 35 | 10 | 8 | 2 |
| | HEG | 28 | 7 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 10 |
| with friends | LEG | 31 | 12 | 39 | 8 | 10 | 0 |
| | HEG | 7 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 0 | 5 |
| with relatives | LEG | 63 | 8 | 19 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| | HEG | 58 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| with neighbours | LEG | 59 | 6 | 29 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| | HEG | 60 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

On the basis of the findings presented in Table 4, it can be suggested that some language shift is taking place among the informants. Irrespective of educational differences, informants communicate mostly in Turkish with their parents. Dutch language use with the parents is minimal. Better-educated informants (HEG) speak generally in Turkish (with mother/father 83%, with relatives 58%, and with neighbours 60%) but with siblings (28%) and friends (7%), these percentages are much lower. Less

educated informants' language use patterns resemble the better-educated group. As a matter of fact, bilingual language use characterizes both groups' language use.

Concerning language choice, better-educated speakers dominantly choose Dutch for a variety of topics (see Table 5). Only concerning religious matters, both groups choose Turkish. The mean values in Table 5 also point to a balanced bilingual language use profile among Turkish immigrants.

**Table 5:** *Language choice patterns across topics. The scale is 1 (only Turkish) to 5 (only Dutch).*

| Language choice | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily topics | LEG | 49 | 2.43 | 1.5 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.82 | 1.28 |
| Academic topics | LEG | 49 | 2.35 | 1.48 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.12 | 1.54 |
| Socio-politic issues | LEG | 49 | 2.43 | 1.61 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.07 | 1.33 |
| Cultural issues | LEG | 49 | 1.96 | 1.38 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.52 | 1.26 |
| Religion | LEG | 49 | 1.61 | 1.02 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.00 | 1.22 |
| Educational issues | LEG | 49 | 2.35 | 1.44 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.75 | 1.35 |

The results about the relative importance of Dutch and Turkish in The Netherlands seem to converge on the language use and choice findings. Even though the findings are based on reported data, given the large number of informants from two different groups, the results show an interesting pattern of language use, choice and language attitudes towards Turkish and Dutch. As presented in Table 6, less educated informants, in general, have higher ratings for the importance of Turkish in The Netherlands, which is in harmony with their language choice patterns.

**Table 6:** *Language attitudes towards Turkish (N = 89). The scale is 1 (not important) to 5 (very important).*

| Importance of Turkish | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| To make friends | LEG | 49 | 3.33 | 1.39 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.70 | 1.43 |
| To make money | LEG | 49 | 2.45 | 1.55 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.95 | 1.24 |
| To study | LEG | 49 | 2.47 | 1.71 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.80 | 1.33 |
| To find a job | LEG | 49 | 2.35 | 1.65 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.92 | 1.38 |
| To receive better education | LEG | 49 | 2.47 | 1.71 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.80 | 1.38 |
| To live in The Netherlands | LEG | 49 | 2.84 | 1.53 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.10 | 1.28 |
| To be valued in the society | LEG | 49 | 3.14 | 1.58 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.60 | 1.48 |
| To raise children | LEG | 49 | 4.00 | 1.34 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.65 | 1.37 |
| To be accepted in Turkish community | LEG | 49 | 3.90 | 1.46 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.85 | 1.37 |
| To speak to Turkish friends | LEG | 49 | 3.69 | 1.36 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.50 | 1.32 |
| To be accepted in Dutch community | LEG | 49 | 2.75 | 1.81 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.92 | 1.35 |
| To speak to colleagues at work | LEG | 49 | 2.86 | 1.66 |
| | HEG | 40 | 1.92 | 1.42 |
| To travel | LEG | 49 | 3.57 | 1.58 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.62 | 1.39 |
| To do trade | LEG | 49 | 3.39 | 1.51 |
| | HEG | 40 | 2.90 | 1.55 |

Concerning language attitudes towards Turkish, both groups of informants report that Turkish is important to be accepted in the Turkish community, to raise children, and with Turkish friends. Less educated informants have higher ratings than older informants for the importance of Turkish to raise children. For instrumental uses such as finding a job, receiving education, and living in The Netherlands, Turkish is considered to be less functional by both groups.

In connection with language attitudes, a number of statements concerning the future of Turkish language in the Netherlands were presented to the informants. Out of 89 informants, 43 persons (48.3%) agreed with the statement that a new variety of Turkish would emerge. 18 informants (12 less-educated and 6 better-educated) agreed with the statement that Turkish will be mostly lost. In the same vein, 23 informants agreed with the statement that Turkish would be lost with the third and subsequent generations. 24 informants remarked that Turkish would be a high status language. The majority (59 persons), however, agreed with the statement that Turkish would only be used in certain domains. Table 7 presents the results on 'future of Turkish'.

**Table 7:** *Future of Turkish in the Netherlands as perceived by low (n = 49) and high (n = 40) education groups*

| Statement in the questionnaire | Education | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | High | |
| A new variety of Turkish will emerge | 24 | 19 | 43 |
| Turkish will be mostly lost | 12 | 6 | 18 |
| Turkish will become a strong and a high status language | 13 | 11 | 24 |
| With the third and following generations Turkish will be lost | 13 | 10 | 23 |
| Turkish will be used in certain domains only | 33 | 26 | 59 |

## Language Rating Scales

When the mean values in Table 8 to 11 are examined, a clear intergroup difference with respect to Dutch and Turkish language proficiency is observed. Better-educated groups have much higher ratings for their Turkish and Dutch skills than the less educated group. The differences become larger, especially concerning higher-level discourse skills, such as comprehending and using abstract concepts and complex sentences. Accordingly,

in understanding the proverbs and idiomatic expressions in Turkish and Dutch the less educated group has much lower ratings compared to the better-educated informants. Table 8 shows the results of language rating scales for Turkish and Dutch listening skills of both groups. Concerning understanding skills, both groups of informants rated their Turkish skills much higher compared to their Dutch skills.

**Table 8:** *Results on Language Rating scales for UNDERSTANDING Turkish and Dutch (N = 89). The scale is 1 (can NOT do it) to 5 (can do it easily).*

| I can … | Groups | Turkish | | | Dutch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
| Understand a simple talk or a story from the context | LEG | 48 | 4.42 | 1.07 | 49 | 3.88 | 1.09 |
| | HEG | 39 | 4.90 | .64 | 40 | 4.67 | .92 |
| Guess the meaning of unknown words in a speech from the context | LEG | 49 | 4.10 | 1.16 | 49 | 3.51 | 1.23 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.60 | .95 | 40 | 4.42 | 1.03 |
| Understand someone's negative or positive opinions on a given topic | LEG | 49 | 4.44 | .94 | 49 | 3.77 | 1.25 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.77 | .83 | 40 | 4.60 | 1.01 |
| Understand a series of events explained in a speech | LEG | 49 | 4.34 | 1.18 | 49 | 3.63 | 1.42 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.75 | .87 | 40 | 4.47 | 1.15 |
| Understand apology | LEG | 49 | 4.53 | 1.02 | 49 | 4.47 | 1.02 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.80 | .85 | 40 | 4.72 | .88 |
| Understand a proposal or a request for help | LEG | 49 | 4.65 | .92 | 49 | 4.53 | .82 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.85 | .80 | 40 | 4.75 | .87 |
| Understand someone's wish or demand on a given topic | LEG | 49 | 4.51 | 1.04 | 49 | 4.26 | 1.02 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.80 | .85 | 40 | 4.70 | .91 |
| Understand abstract words and concepts | LEG | 49 | 4.19 | 1.33 | 49 | 3.55 | 1.34 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.47 | 1.04 | 40 | 4.35 | 1.03 |
| Understand complex sentences | LEG | 49 | 4.10 | 1.12 | 49 | 3.08 | 1.41 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.32 | .97 | 40 | 4.25 | 1.08 |
| Understand idiomatic expressions and proverbs | LEG | 49 | 4.26 | 1.20 | 49 | 2.92 | 1.50 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.40 | .95 | 40 | 3.60 | 1.26 |

In general, compared to language production skills, passive comprehension skills in a language are presumed to be higher. In order to test that assumption, total scores obtained from ten comprehension and ten speaking tasks (both for Dutch and Turkish) were divided by ten and then by the total number of informants. The results obtained confirm the assumption that comprehension skills are higher than the speaking skills. The *mean* value for Turkish understanding scale is 4.48 whereas the *mean* value for speaking is 4.35. In the same vein, the *mean* value for Dutch understanding scale is 4.07 while the *mean* value for speaking is 3.84. This result also confirms the outcome that Turkish skills of the informants are higher than their Dutch skills. Similar to understanding skills, better-educated groups have much higher speaking skills in Turkish and in Dutch than the less educated group. Both groups have difficulty in using more abstract terms and concepts, as well as idiomatic expressions and proverbs in Dutch.

**Table 9:** *Results on Language Rating scales for SPEAKING Turkish and Dutch (N = 89). The scale is 1 (can NOT do it) to 5 (can do it easily).*

| I can … | Groups | Turkish | | | Dutch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
| Express my feelings and opinions on a given topic | LEG | 49 | 4.43 | 1.32 | 49 | 3.35 | 1.55 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.70 | .91 | 40 | 4.40 | 1.15 |
| Ask for clarification when I do not understand something | LEG | 49 | 4.43 | 1.35 | 49 | 3.98 | 1.49 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.75 | .93 | 40 | 4.72 | .85 |
| Correct my own speech if what I say is not understood | LEG | 49 | 4.43 | 1.30 | 49 | 3.69 | 1.34 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.67 | .89 | 40 | 4.50 | 1.04 |
| Offer apology (with appropriate terms) | LEG | 49 | 4.55 | 1.24 | 49 | 4.51 | 1.10 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.82 | .81 | 40 | 4.72 | .88 |
| Ask for help or offer help | LEG | 49 | 4.51 | 1.31 | 49 | 4.18 | 1.27 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.80 | .82 | 40 | 4.70 | .94 |
| Ask for information from the others | LEG | 49 | 4.26 | 1.35 | 49 | 3.88 | 1.48 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.75 | .84 | 40 | 4.60 | .95 |
| Use abstract words in a speech | LEG | 49 | 3.63 | 1.72 | 49 | 2.95 | 1.64 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.35 | 1.19 | 40 | 4.05 | 1.28 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Construct complex sentences in speaking | LEG | 49 | 3.59 | 1.53 | 49 | 2.65 | 1.53 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.10 | 1.26 | 40 | 3.95 | 1.30 |
| Use idiomatic expressions and proverbs in speech | LEG | 49 | 3.92 | 1.52 | 49 | 2.57 | 1.63 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.22 | .99 | 40 | 3.37 | 1.41 |
| Make jokes in speech | LEG | 49 | 4.28 | 1.43 | 49 | 3.24 | 1.57 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.27 | 1.53 | 40 | 3.72 | 1.75 |

On the basis of the results presented in Table 10 and 11, it appears that reading skills of Turkish immigrants in Turkish and Dutch appear to be higher than their writing skills. Similar to understanding and speaking skills, better educated informants have higher ratings both for their Dutch and Turkish reading and writing skills. Overall, for the whole population, the *mean* value for Turkish reading scale is 4.18 whereas the *mean* value for writing is 3.76. In the same vein, the *mean* value for Dutch reading scale is 3.64 while the *mean* value for writing is 3.20.

**Table 10:** *Results on Language Rating scales for READING Turkish and Dutch (N = 89). The scale is 1 (can NOT do it) to 5 (can do it easily).*

| I can … | Groups | Turkish | | | Dutch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
| Read and understand an advertisement | LEG | 45 | 4.53 | 1.03 | 49 | 3.63 | 1.58 |
| | HEG | 38 | 4.87 | .66 | 40 | 4.47 | 1.26 |
| Understand the information in a brochure | LEG | 49 | 4.08 | 1.55 | 49 | 3.41 | 1.63 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.57 | 1.19 | 40 | 4.52 | 1.26 |
| Understand the information presented in a manual or an application form | LEG | 49 | 4.06 | 1.59 | 49 | 3.41 | 1.67 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.47 | 1.26 | 40 | 4.45 | 1.17 |
| Understand a poem | LEG | 49 | 3.84 | 1.75 | 49 | 2.92 | 1.70 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.55 | 1.20 | 40 | 4.02 | 1.39 |
| Read and understand a newspaper | LEG | 49 | 4.18 | 1.63 | 49 | 3.49 | 1.70 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.57 | 1.19 | 40 | 4.47 | 1.18 |
| Read and understand a book | LEG | 49 | 4.14 | 1.55 | 49 | 3.00 | 1.77 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.50 | 1.26 | 40 | 4.30 | 1.30 |
| Understand register specific terms and phrases in a text | LEG | 49 | 3.75 | 1.64 | 49 | 2.84 | 1.69 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.37 | 1.15 | 40 | 3.92 | 1.33 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Guess the meaning of unknown words in a text from the context | LEG | 49 | 3.55 | 1.58 | 49 | 2.75 | 1.61 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.37 | 1.21 | 40 | 4.10 | 1.26 |
| Understand the abstract concepts and words encountered in a text | LEG | 49 | 3.55 | 1.65 | 49 | 2.71 | 1.68 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.05 | 1.43 | 40 | 3.87 | 1.30 |
| Understand the texts containing complex sentences | LEG | 49 | 3.53 | 1.66 | 49 | 2.69 | 1.70 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.05 | 1.43 | 40 | 3.75 | 1.51 |

Writing is the most difficult skill in all languages. The literacy level and education plays an important role in the acquisition of this skill. Due to educational differences, there are clear differences between the Dutch and Turkish writing skills of the informants. Better-educated group has significantly higher scores for writing skills in both languages. Nevertheless, even the writing scores of better-educated informants are lower compared to their reading scores.

**Table 11:** *Results on Language Rating scales for WRITING Turkish and Dutch (N = 89). The scale is 1 (can NOT do it) to 5 (can do it easily).*

| I can … | Groups | Turkish | | | Dutch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
| Write a letter to friends and relatives | LEG | 45 | 4.02 | 1.45 | 49 | 2.71 | 1.77 |
| | HEG | 38 | 4.63 | .75 | 40 | 4.22 | 1.35 |
| Fill in an application form | LEG | 49 | 3.86 | 1.67 | 49 | 3.51 | 1.59 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.30 | 1.24 | 40 | 4.30 | 1.24 |
| Express my opinions in writing | LEG | 49 | 3.82 | 1.67 | 49 | 2.82 | 1.63 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.27 | 1.36 | 40 | 4.00 | 1.45 |
| Write an informative text for a newspaper | LEG | 49 | 3.24 | 1.68 | 49 | 2.55 | 1.61 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.07 | 1.29 | 40 | 3.62 | 1.39 |
| Compose a poem | LEG | 49 | 3.02 | 1.95 | 49 | 1.98 | 1.48 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.52 | 1.52 | 40 | 2.87 | 1.47 |
| Search and find the necessary words (from a dictionary) in writing a | LEG | 49 | 3.43 | 1.77 | 49 | 2.82 | 1.79 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.50 | 1.24 | 40 | 4.35 | 1.41 |
| Use terms and expressions in composing a text | LEG | 49 | 3.33 | 1.78 | 49 | 2.51 | 1.67 |
| | HEG | 40 | 4.05 | 1.32 | 40 | 3.45 | 1.48 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use abstract concepts in writing | LEG | 49 | 3.06 | 1.79 | 49 | 2.41 | 1.63 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.87 | 1.43 | 40 | 3.50 | 1.58 |
| Write using complex sentences | LEG | 49 | 3.10 | 1.71 | 49 | 2.39 | 1.60 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.80 | 1.50 | 40 | 3.45 | 1.48 |
| Write a business letter | LEG | 49 | 3.43 | 1.72 | 49 | 2.65 | 1.71 |
| | HEG | 40 | 3.85 | 1.44 | 40 | 3.95 | 1.39 |

## Ethnolinguistic Vitality Perceptions

Results of the subjective ethnolinguistic vitality questionnaire show that both groups of Turkish informants generally give Dutch group higher vitality ratings than the Turkish group. Only on the variables as birth-rate, extent of in-group marriage, pride of cultural history, language used in religious worship, extent of in-group solidarity, and importance of norms and values for the group, both the less and higher educated informants give Turkish higher vitality ratings than Dutch. In Table 12, the mean values of the items in SEVQ for Dutch and Turkish vitalities are presented.

**Table 12:** *Turkish immigrants' ethnolinguistic vitality ratings of their own group and of the Dutch (N = 89). The scale is a 7-point scale, 1 indicates minimum vitality, while 7 indicates maximum vitality.*

| Sevq variables | Dutch vitality | | Turkish Vitality | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LEG | HEG | LEG | HEG |
| 1) Proportion of population | 5.26 | 5.90 | 3.10 | 2.12 |
| 2) Perceived language status locally | 5.98 | 6.72 | 3.43 | 2.85 |
| 3) Perceived language status internationally | 3.96 | 2.25 | 3.35 | 2.97 |
| 4) Amount of Dutch/Turkish in government services | 6.71 | 6.65 | 1.79 | 1.95 |
| 5) Dutch/Turkish birth-rate | 3.94 | 3.35 | 4.51 | 4.30 |
| 6) Dutch/ Turkish control over business | 5.71 | 6.32 | 3.49 | 2.65 |
| 7) Dutch/Turkish language in mass-media | 5.51 | 6.00 | 2.39 | 3.00 |
| 8) Perceived group status | 5.73 | 6.50 | 4.10 | 3.10 |
| 9) Proportion of Dutch/ Turkish locally | 4.92 | 5.62 | 4.18 | 3.25 |
| 10) Dutch/ Turkish language at school | 6.39 | 6.67 | 2.02 | 1.75 |
| 11) Dutch/ Turkish immigration patterns | 2.39 | 2.37 | 3.04 | 3.57 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12) In-group marriage | 4.59 | 4.17 | 5.96 | 5.97 |
| 13) Dutch/ Turkish political power | 6.20 | 6.45 | 3.12 | 2.45 |
| 14) Dutch/ Turkish language in business | 6.33 | 6.57 | 2.47 | 1.95 |
| 15) Dutch/ Turkish emigration pattern | 2.49 | 2.47 | 2.20 | 2.15 |
| 16) Pride of cultural history | 5.00 | 3.90 | 6.12 | 6.35 |
| 17) Dutch/ Turkish language of worship | 4.43 | 4.15 | 5.39 | 5.22 |
| 18) Group's cultural representation | 5.20 | 6.00 | 3.47 | 3.00 |
| 19) Perceived group strength | 5.57 | 5.87 | 4.18 | 3.52 |
| 20) Group wealth | 4.84 | 5.25 | 4.14 | 3.17 |
| 21) Predicted future strength | 5.77 | 4.92 | 4.88 | 5.00 |
| 22) Extent of in-group solidarity | 4.47 | 4.05 | 5.08 | 5.17 |
| 23) Importance of norms and values for the group | 4.47 | 3.65 | 5.86 | 6.12 |
| 24) Perceived contact between the Dutch and the Turkish groups | | | | |

In general, almost on all the items, less educated Turkish informants give Turkish higher vitality ratings than the better-educated informants. Correspondingly, the less educated informants' ratings for Dutch vitality are lower compared to better-educated informants. Thus, the difference between the Dutch and Turkish vitalities is smaller for the less-educated group. The differences in vitality ratings for the Dutch and Turkish concerning the demographic and status factors are not so large as the differences for the institutional support factors. In terms of the perceived contact between the mainstream community members and the Turkish group, the better-educated informants have higher ratings (*Mean* = 4.49) than the less educated informants (*Mean* = 3.95), which, in a way, shows the integration level of both groups in the mainstream community. Because better-educated informants live and work more with the mainstream community members, they report more contact between the two groups.

## Testing the hypotheses

Given the large number of variables in the three questionnaires, data reduction was needed for more advanced statistics. By means of the SPSS computing procedure, a sum score for each of the language use, choice, and attitudes were obtained. In the same fashion, sum scores for language rating scales (Dutch and Turkish), vitality of Turkish and Dutch were calculated. On the basis of this data reduction, total scores for each in-

formant on these new scales were obtained. In order to identify internal-consistency estimation of the items in these scales, the variables were subjected to *Reliability Analysis.* The reliability coefficients obtained were very high. It was *Alpha* = .89 for the language use scale (5 items); *Alpha* = .89 for the language choice scale (6 items); and it was *Alpha* = .89 for the language attitudes scale (14 items). Accordingly, the reliability coefficients obtained for language rating scale Turkish (40 items) *Alpha* = .83 and for Dutch (40 items) *Alpha* = .89 were very high. There were 23 items in each of the Turkish and Dutch vitality scales. The reliability coefficients for the Turkish and Dutch vitality scales were both high (*Alpha* = .89).

In order to test the two hypotheses stated earlier, a t-test between lower educated (LEG) and higher educated informants' (HEG) scores for language use (named USE), language attitudes (ATUDE), language choice (CHOICE), Language rating scales Turkish as Turkish proficiency (TURPR), Language rating scales Dutch as Dutch proficiency (DUTPR), Turkish vitality (VITUR), Dutch vitality (VITDUT), Status of Turkish (TRSTATU), Status of Dutch (DUTSTATU), Demography Turkish (TURKDEMO), Demography Dutch (DUTCDEMO), Institutional Support Turk (TURKSUPO), and Institutional Support Dutch (DUTCSUPO) was done. The following table summarises the results of a t-test between the two groups of informants.

**Table 13:** *t-test results for the given scales by educational differences (N = 89)*

| Dimension | Group | Mean | SD | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Language use (USE) [1] | LEG (n=49) | 9.98 | 4.63 | .769 | .444 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 9.30 | 3.46 | | |
| Attitudes towards Turkish (ATUDE) [2] | LEG (n=49) | 43.20 | 14.42 | 2.611 | .011* |
| | HEG (n=40) | 35.35 | 13.72 | | |
| Language choice (CHOICE) [3] | LEG (n=49) | 13.12 | 7.02 | -2.181 | .032* |
| | HEG (n=40) | 16.30 | 6.59 | | |
| Turkish proficiency (TURPR) [4] | LEG (n=45) | 168.98 | 30.19 | -2.583 | .012* |
| | HEG (n=38) | 183.92 | 20.63 | | |
| Dutch proficiency (DUTPR) [4] | LEG (n=49) | 129.84 | 47.37 | -3.937 | .000** |
| | HEG (n=40) | 166.92 | 39.98 | | |
| Turkish Vitality Scale (VITUR) [5] | LEG (n=49) | 88.28 | 20.46 | 1.681 | .096 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 81.62 | 16.01 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dutch Vitality Scale (VITDUT) [5] | LEG (n=49) | 115.88 | 14.61 | .010 | .992 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 115.85 | 9.80 | | |
| Status of Turkish (TRSTATU) [6] | LEG (n=49) | 44.63 | 9.80 | 1.906 | .060 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 40.92 | 8.22 | | |
| Status of Dutch (DUTSTATU) [6] | LEG (n=49) | 51.51 | 7.85 | 1.350 | .181 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 49.45 | 6.20 | | |
| Demography Turkish (TURKDEMO) [7] | LEG (n=49) | 23.00 | 6.52 | 1.322 | .190 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 21.37 | 4.68 | | |
| Demography Dutch (DUTCDEMO) [7] | LEG (n=49) | 23.59 | 6.01 | -.260 | .795 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 23.90 | 4.94 | | |
| Institutional Support Turk (TURKSUPO) [8] | LEG (n=49) | 20.65 | 7.08 | .982 | .329 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 19.32 | 5.30 | | |
| Institutional Support Dutch (DUTCSUPO) [8] | LEG (n=49) | 40.77 | 5.12 | -1.613 | .110 |
| | HEG (n=40) | 42.50 | 4.88 | | |

[1] Mean values closer to 5 means only Turkish and values closer to 25 means only Dutch language use. [2] Mean values closer to 14 indicate low evaluation of Turkish while scores closer to 70 point to high evaluation. [3] Mean values closer to 6 indicate choice for Turkish while scores closer to 30 indicates choice for Dutch. [4] Minimum score is 40 while maximum score is 200. [5] Minimum vitality score is 23 while maximum vitality score is 161. [6] Minimum score is 10, while maximum score is 70. [7] Minimum score is 6, while maximum score is 42. [8] Minimum score is 7, while maximum score is 49.

In order to test the first hypothesis stated earlier, a t-test between the language attitudes scores of better and less educated informants is carried out. As opposed to our expectations, less-educated Turkish immigrants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish than the better-educated informants. As a result of testing the second hypothesis it is seen that less educated informants have higher in-group vitality ratings than the better-educated informants. There are also significant differences between the two groups' scores concerning the importance of Turkish in The Netherlands, and language choice. Apparently, less-educated group chooses to use more Turkish than the better-educated Turkish immigrants. There are

significant differences between the Dutch and Turkish proficiencies of the less educated and better-educated informants. Even though the high-educated group has much better Turkish skills, they have lower ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. Nevertheless, that difference does not reach any significance level. Also concerning the demography, status, and institutional support factors, there are no significant differences between the less and better-educated informants.

Other than education, *country of birth* and *gender* are claimed to have an effect upon language use, choice and ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. In order to see the accuracy of such claims, a t-test between the Netherlands (NL) and Turkey (TR) born informants on the same scales (See Table 13 above) was done. 25 informants reported their birth country as the Netherlands, while 63 informants reported Turkey as their country of birth. Statistically significant differences were found with regard to the status of Turkish (TRSTATU) (*Mean* NL = 46.56, *SD* NL = 8.66; *Mean* TR = 41.43, *SD* TR = 9.18, $t(86) = 2.40$, $p = 0.19$) indicating a higher status of Turkish among Dutch born Turkish informants. Also concerning DUTSTATU (*Mean* NL = 52.96, *SD* NL = 5.86; *Mean* TR = 49.59, *SD* TR = 7.53, $t(86) = 2.01$, $p = 0.48$), TURKSUPO (*Mean* NL = 22.24, *SD* NL = 6.94; *Mean* TR = 19.25, *SD* TR = 5.97, $t(86) = 2.02$, $p = 0.47$), VITUR (*Mean* NL = 92.68, *SD* NL = 19.70; *Mean* TR = 82.33, *SD* TR = 17.88, $t(86) = 2.38$, $p = 0.20$), VITDUT (*Mean* NL = 120.16, *SD* NL = 9.99; *Mean* TR = 114.25, *SD* TR = 13.28, $t(86) = 2.01$, $p = 0.48$), CHOICE (*Mean* NL = 17.48, *SD* NL = 7.53; *Mean* TR = 13.46, *SD* TR = 6.50, $t(86) = 2.50$, $p = 0.14$), ATUDE (*Mean* NL = 34.48, *SD* NL = 15.59; *Mean* TR = 41.41, *SD* TR = 13.67, $t(86) = -2.06$, $p = 0.42$), and DUTPR (*Mean* NL = 178.08, *SD* NL = 25.42; *Mean* TR = 133.87, *SD* TR = 49.15, $t(86) = 4.26$, $p = .000$), there were significant differences that the Netherlands born Turkish informants had higher scores than Turkey born informants. The only exception was language choice (CHOICE) and attitudes (ATUDE), in those TR-born informants choose more Turkish in different domains and had higher ratings for the importance of Turkish than the NL born informants. In terms of gender differences, female (F) respondents had higher ratings for Turkish vitality than the male (M) respondents VITUR (*Mean* F = 91.43, *SD* F = 17.26; *Mean* M = 78.22, *SD* M = 18.30, $t(86) = 3.37$, $p = .001$).

When country of birth is taken as the grouping criteria, Dutch language skills of the Netherlands born Turkish informants turn out to be much higher than the Turkey born informants. Whereas concerning Turkish

skills, there are no significant differences between these groups. As seen from Table 14, there are significant differences between the Dutch skills of Turkey and the Netherlands born informants. Concerning Dutch language proficiency, there are also very large differences within the Turkey born group (*SD* = 49.15). The in-group differences might be due to education received in the language.

**Table 14:** *Language proficiency differences of Turkey and the Netherlands born informants*

| Language Skills | Country of Birth | N | Mean | SD | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Turkish | The Netherlands | 24 | 172.17 | 28.65 | -.717 | .475 |
| | Turkey | 58 | 176.91 | 26.68 | | |
| Dutch | The Netherlands | 25 | 178.08 | 25.42 | 4.266 | .000 |
| | Turkey | 63 | 133.87 | 49.15 | | |

**Note:** *Minimum score is 40 while maximum score is 200.*

Because the informants, who are born in the Netherlands, have gone through the Dutch school system, one would tend to assume that their acculturation level should be higher compared to the informants who are born in Turkey. Yet, when t-test differences obtained from vitality scores and other dimensions are examined, the Turkish informants born in the Netherlands turn out to be more Turkish language and culture oriented than the informants born in Turkey. There can be a number of explanations for this: firstly, informants born in the Netherlands have been schooled in this country and they have much better Dutch skills and they have more knowledge about the Dutch society and institutions and their judgements are more accurate. Taking a negative stand, it can also be suggested that due to current anti-immigrant discourse in the media, informants born in the Netherlands take a reactionary position and they exaggerate their in-group vitality. Finally, considering much lower Dutch skills, Turkey born informants have less access to societal institutions and they cannot accurately judge the in- and out-group vitalities.

**Table 15a:** *Pearson correlations between sociolinguistic dimensions and ethnolinguistic vitality scales*

| | VITUR | VITDUT | TURPR | DUTPR | ATUDE | CHOICE | USE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VITUR | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| VITDUT | .423** | 1.000 | | | | | |
| TURPR | .022 | -.012 | 1.000 | | | | |
| DUTPR | .106 | .238* | .251* | 1.000 | | | |
| ATUDE | .123 | -.214* | -.034 | -.252* | 1.000 | | |
| CHOICE | -.008 | -.010 | -.159 | .311** | -.029 | 1.000 | |
| USE | .114 | -.014 | -.311** | .070 | .176 | .714** | 1.000 |
| TRSTATU | .916** | .478** | .047 | .044 | .162 | -.063 | .094 |
| DUTSTATU | .501** | .773** | -.083 | .032 | -.034 | .065 | .126 |
| TURDEMO | .866** | .297** | .057 | .142 | .068 | -.070 | .062 |
| DUTCDEMO | .247* | .681** | -.160 | .280** | -.145 | .020 | .000 |
| TURKSUPO | .833** | .282** | -.057 | .119 | .066 | .131 | .146 |
| DUTCSUPO | .071 | .650** | .285** | .242* | -.326** | -.137 | -.213* |

**Table 15b:** *Pearson correlations between sociolinguistic dimensions and ethnolinguistic vitality scales*

| | TRSTATU | DUTSTATU | TURDEMO | DUTCDEMO | TURKSUPO | DUTCSUPO |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TRSTATU | 1.000 | | | | | |
| DUTSTATU | .578** | 1.000 | | | | |
| TURDEMO | .701** | .297** | 1.000 | | | |
| DUTCDEMO | .183 | .244* | .239* | 1.000 | | |
| TURKSUPO | .612** | .367** | .627** | .247* | 1.000 | |
| DUTCSUPO | .170 | .237* | .057 | .258* | -.089 | 1.000 |

In order to test the third hypothesis, language use, attitudes, and choice scores of LEG and HEG informants were correlated with subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. As seen in Table 15a and 15b, there is no significant correlation between ethnolinguistic vitality of the Turkish

group and their language use, which again disproves our third hypothesis. However, there are significant correlations between language use and choice of the informants. For instance, there is significant correlation between Dutch proficiency and language choice. Better-educated group had much higher proficiency levels in Dutch and they also choose more Dutch in interaction with others. There is also a significant relation between Dutch and Turkish proficiencies. Educational level and proficiency in Dutch and Turkish are reasonably related in that high proficiency in one language is associated with high proficiency in the other as well. Between Turkish proficiency and language use there is a negative correlation, which is actually not very surprising because better-educated informants are highly proficient in Turkish and Dutch but their language choice depends on the interlocutor and the topic. Correspondingly, less-educated informants are less proficient in Turkish but they mostly use Turkish in a number of domains. Even if some informants think that their Turkish is poor, they still interact in Turkish with their parents, friends and relatives. Less educated informants rate their proficiency in Turkish lower compared to the better-educated informants but they have higher vitality ratings for Turkish than the better-educated immigrants, which in a way shows the complicated relationship between language use-proficiency and ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. On the other hand, there are very high correlations between demography, status, and institutional support factors. Also, there is a very high correlation between the vitality of Turkish and the status of Turkish. Accordingly, demographic characteristics of Turkish and institutional support factors of Turkish have very high correlations with the overall Turkish vitality, which shows conceptual consistency of ethnolinguistic vitality theory. Table 15a and 15b also clearly show that minority and majority vitalities are related. If the majority group dominates an ethnic group, dominated group might develop a number of strategies against the dominant group. In that respect power relations between the groups is highly related to their vitality perceptions. In a way, the correlation between Turkish and Dutch vitalities is a reflection of that relationship.

## Discussion and Conclusions

The research presented in this section investigated possible relationships between Turkish immigrants' ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions and their language maintenance, use and choice patterns. On the basis of the survey results, we have a better understanding of the factors that support Turkish language maintenance. The findings show that Turkish is mostly spoken in the domestic domain and in the neighbourhood with other Turkish immigrants. Similar to other immigration settings, such as Australia,

Germany, and France, Turkish immigrants in The Netherlands concentrate in certain working-class suburbs, which provide them with a rich network of first language speakers. Turkish community organizations such as religious associations -especially mosques-, sports clubs or cultural institutions provide a rich social network for the community. Even though there is very little institutional support from the mainstream community for first language maintenance, Turkish language mass media are readily available in The Netherlands and combined with Turkish language teaching at schools, basic conditions for first language maintenance are available. Turkish maintains its dominant role in the domestic domain and children born into those families acquire Turkish as their first language. On the basis of the research findings presented here, some important conceptual issues with respect to ethnolinguistic vitality and its measurement arise. The concept of institutional support factors need to be further developed into the mainstream and ethnic institutions. In the final discussion and conclusions section of this chapter, some methodological and conceptual issues will be further elucidated.

In previous studies on language maintenance and shift, education has been identified as a significant variable affecting language maintenance and shift. According to Kloss (cited in Kipp et al. 1995) education is an ambivalent factor that may either result in a faster shift to the host language (L2) or in greater maintenance of the first language (L1). Depending on the language contact context and the speech community concerned, either a complete shift to L2 (as in the case of educated immigrants settling in Canada) or stronger language maintenance of L1 (Greeks in Australia) is observed. The findings of this study have contributed further evidence to the role of education for language maintenance and shift. Better-educated Turkish immigrants have higher proficiency levels both in L1 and L2 compared to less educated informants but their attitudes towards Turkish is not as positive as the less educated group. Correspondingly, better-educated group has lower estimation of ethnolinguistic vitality of the Turkish group in the Netherlands.

Turkish immigrants in other immigration contexts have different vitality ratings for the in-group (Yagmur, et al., 1999; Yagmur & Akinci, 2003). Thus, ethnic groups develop more than one strategy in language contact settings. They may systematically minimize or exaggerate the vitality of their own or other groups, depending on how much they identify with their own group, their degree of social interaction with in- and out-group members, their language choice in various settings, and whether they see

intergroup settings as positive or negative (Bourhis et al., 1981; Leets & Giles, 1995; Sachdev et al., 1987). Furthermore, it is suggested that group survival and language maintenance are dependent on the perceptions and behaviour of succeeding generations of ethnolinguistic groups (Sachdev, et al., 1987). Reitz (cited in Sachdev et al., 1987) reports on the status of Chinese in Canada. Although Chinese is used by first generation immigrants widely, it is less prevalent among the second generation and almost not to be found in the third generation. However, in this study, The Netherlands born second-generation Turkish informants had higher vitality ratings than the first-generation immigrants, while they used equally much Turkish. Finally, in spite of large differences between Turkish proficiency of less educated and better-educated informants, less educated informants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish and also have higher vitality ratings for the in-group than the better-educated immigrants, which also points to the difficult link between language dominance and language preference. It is important to remember that language preference and dominance change over time and there is not always a one-to-one correlation between dominance and preference.

## References

Allard, Real & Rodrigue Landry. (1986) "Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Viewed as a Belief System". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7 (1): 1-11.

Bourhis, Y. Richard (2001). "Acculturation, language maintenance, and language shift". In: Jetske Klatter-Folmer & Piet van Avermaet (eds.). *Theories on maintenance and loss of minority languages: Towards a more integrated explanatory framework*. Berlin/New York: Waxmann. 5-37.

Bourhis, Y. Richard & Sachdev, Itesh (1984) "Vitality Perceptions and Language Attitudes: Some Canadian Data". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 3 (2): 97-126.

Bourhis, Y. Richard, Howard Giles & Doreen Rosenthal (1981). "Notes on the Construction of a 'subjective vitality questionnaire' for Ethnolinguistic Groups". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2 (2): 145-155.

Brants, Kees, Liesbeth Crone & Andra Leurdijk (1998). *Media en migranten*. (Media and Migrants). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Clark, J.L. (1981). "Language". In: T.S. Barrows (ed.). *College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding*. New Rochelle, NY, Change Magazine Press 25-35, 87-100.

De Bot, Kees. & Toke Lintsen (1989). "Perception of own language proficiency by elderly adults". *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics* 83-84: 51-61

Giles, Howard, Richard Bourhis & M. Donald Taylor (1977). "Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations". In H. Giles (ed.). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press. 307-348.

Leets, Laura. & Howard Giles (1995). "Dimensions of Minority Language Survival/Non- Survival: Intergroup Cognitions and Communication Climates". In: Willem Fase, Koen Jaspaert & Sjaak Kroon (eds.). *The State of Minority Languages: International Perspectives on Survival and Decline*. Lisse: Sweets & Zeitlenger. 37-73.

Sachdev, Itesh et al. (1987). "Language Attitudes and Vitality Perceptions: Intergenerational Effects Amongst Chinese Canadian Communities". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6 (3-4): 287- 307.

Waas, Margrit (1993). *Language Attrition among German Speakers in Australia: A Sociolinguistic Inquiry*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Weltens, Bert (1988). *The Attrition of French as a Foreign Language*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Yagmur, Kutlay (1997) *First Language Attrition among Turkish Speakers in Sydney*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Yagmur, Kutlay & Mehmet Ali Akinci (2003). "Language use, choice, maintenance and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 164: 107-128.

Yagmur, Kutlay, Kees de Bot & Korzilius, Hubert (1999). "Language Attrition, Language Shift and Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Turkish in Australia". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20 (1): 51-69.

bilig
YAZ 2015 / SAYI 74
259-286

# Hollanda'da Türkçe Konuşurlarında Dili Koruma ve Değiştirme Kalıpları

**Kutlay Yağmur**[*]
**Dürdane Bayram Jacobs**[**]

**Öz**

Bu makalede Hollanda Türk toplumunun anadili korunumu ve etnik dilsel canlılık algıları tartışılmaktadır. Giles, Bourhis & Taylor'nin (1977) etnik dilsel canlılık kuramsal çerçevesini kullanarak Türk göçmenlerin anadili kullanımı, tercihi ve dil tutumlarına ilişkin veri toplanmıştır. Eğitimin dil kullanımı üzerindeki etkisi düşünülerek, eğitim bağımsız bir değişken olarak kullanılarak veriler analiz edilmiştir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları eğitimin anadili korunumu ve kaybı konusundaki rolü üzerine değerli katkılar sunmuştur. Yüksek eğitimli Türk göçmenler hem anadillerinde hem de Hollandacada çok daha yetkin durumdadırlar; ancak Türkçeye ilişkin tutumları düşük eğitimli göçmenler kadar olumlu değildir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler**

Türk göçmenleri, Hollanda, etnik dilsel canlılık, anadili korunumu ve kaybı.

[*] Prof. Dr. Tilburg Üniversitesi, Kültür Çalışmaları Bölümü – Tilburg / Hollanda
k.yagmur@tilburguniversity.edu

[**] Dr., Tilburg Üniversitesi, Kültür Çalışmaları Bölümü – Tilburg / Hollanda
durdane@secmo.nl

*билиг*
Лето *2015 / Выпуск 74*
*259-286*

# Формы Защиты и Изменения Языка Потребителей Турецкого В Голландии

**Кутлай Ягмур**[*]
**Дурдане Байрам Джакобс**[**]

**Аннотация**

В этой статье обсуждается сохранение родного языка и восприятие этнолингвистической жизнеспособности турецкой общиной в Нидерландах. Используя теоретические рамки этнолингвистической жизнеспособности Джайлса, Бурхиса и Тейлора (1977) были собраны материалы об использовании родного языка турецкими иммигрантами, их языковых предпочтениях и отношениях. Учитывая влияние образования на использование языка, при анализе данных образование было рассмотрено как независимая переменная. Результаты данного исследования внесли ценный вклад в определение роли образования в сохранении и потере родного языка. Высокообразованные турецкие иммигранты в совершенстве владеют как родным, так и голландским языком, однако их отношение к родному турецкому языку не такое позитивное, как у менее образованных турецких мигрантов.

**Ключевые слова**

турецкие иммигранты, Нидерланды, этнолингвистическая жизнеспособность, сохранение и потеря родного языка

[*] Проф.док.кафедра культурных наук, университет – Тилбург / Нидерланды
k.yagmur@tilburguniversity.edu

[**] Док., университет Тилбурга, кафедра культурных наук – Тилбург / Нидерланды
durdane@secmo.nl